

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 01 2007

7

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 54-67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention. In response, claims 54-67 have been canceled and new claims 68-81 have been presented. The term "oscillation preventing means" has been replaced, as suggested by the Examiner, with the term "oscillation preventing means". Moreover, the word "rigidly" has been cancelled.

In new claim 72, which substantially corresponds to canceled claim 58, the term "perfect fit" has been deleted and replaced by the term "locking fit". New claim 74, which substantially corresponds to previous claim 60, points out that the coaxially opposed pins have been distinguished by the reference numbers 23 and 24 as suggested by the Examiner. New claim 75, which substantially corresponds to previous claim 61, uses the term "prevent said pin from further rotating" in place of the term "constitute perfect fits".

In new claim 76, which substantially corresponds to previous claim 62, the word "project" has been replaced by the plural word "projects".


Finally, in new claim 80, which substantially corresponds to previous claim 66, the word "herein" has been replaced by the word "wherein".

Since the Examiner noted that canceled claims 54 to 67 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second

8

paragraph, and since the newly presented claims are in proper form for allowance, favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



James V. Costigan
Registration No. 25,669

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
(212) 302-8989